



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/742,795	12/20/2000	Brian J. Moore	2690	8447

7590 03/20/2006

Law Offices of Albert S. Michalik, PLLC
704-228th Avenue NE
Suite 193
Sammamish, WA 98074

EXAMINER

ZHONG, CHAD

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2152

DATE MAILED: 03/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/742,795

Applicant(s)

MOORE ET AL.

Examiner

Chad Zhong

Art Unit

2152

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 January 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 31-34 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

FINAL ACTION

1. Applicant's arguments, see pages 9-21 of applicant's remarks, filed 01/18/2006, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-30 under 35 USC 102(e) and 35 USC 103(a) have been fully considered and are not persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been maintained. This action has been made final.

Specification

2. Applicant is required to update the status (pending, allowed, etc.) of all parent priority applications in the first line of the specification. The status of all citations of US filed applications in the specification should also be updated where appropriate.

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

4. Claims 1-4, 10-20, 22-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Palaniappan, US 6,711,557.

5. As per claim 1, Palaniappan teaches a computer-implemented method, comprising:
at a client computer, obtaining information about the availability of at least one update and obtaining information about the unavailability of at least one update from a server (Col. 2, lines 10-21; Col. 3, lines 25-35; Col. 4, lines 10-15, where the information is the meta-information, and version information dictates the availability and unavailability of the software package);
storing the information about available and unavailable updates at a local cache on the client computer (Col. 3, lines 52 through Col. 4, line 2); and

Art Unit: 2152

in response to a request for update information that may be available at the server, accessing the local cache to retrieve the information about available updates (Col. 4, lines 10-15, lines 25-35, lines 49-52).

5. As per claim 2, Palaniappan teaches obtaining information includes accessing at least one Internet website (Fig 1, item 20).

6. As per claim 3, Palaniappan teaches obtaining information about available updates from the server includes obtaining data that changes the information about available updates in the local cache (Col. 3, lines 35-40).

7. As per claim 4, Palaniappan teaches storing the information about available updates includes storing data identifying whether a hardware device has a driver available for download from an online site (inherent in Col. 3, lines 35-40).

8. As per claim 10, Palaniappan teaches the data corresponding to the hardware device is present and indicates a version number of an available driver for that hardware device (inherent in Col. 4, lines 45-65; and Col. 1, lines 55-65).

9. As per claim 11, Palaniappan teaches storing the information about available updates includes storing data identifying whether at least one software component is available for download from an online site (Col. 3, lines 35-40).

10. As per claim 12, Palaniappan teaches at least one software component is available, and further comprising storing data identifying whether installation of at least one available software component is dependent on installation of at least one other software component (Col. 4, lines 15-30).

11. As per claim 13, Palaniappan teaches at least one software component is available, and further

Art Unit: 2152

comprising storing data identifying a version for at least one available software component (Col. 4, lines 45-65, wherein the version identification is inherently taught in Palaniappan, without version identifiers Palaniappan's system can not differentiate the newer versions of software updates that's available on the server).

12. As per claim 14, Palaniappan teaches accessing the local cache to retrieve the information about available updates indicates that an update is available, and further comprising, persisting information about the available update (Col. 3, lines 50-60).

13. As per claim 15, Palaniappan teaches downloading updates at a time when a connection exists based on the information persisted about the available update (Col. 4, lines 50-60).

14. As per claim 16, Palaniappan teaches accessing the local cache to retrieve the information about available updates indicates that an update is available, and further comprising, downloading the available update (Col. 4, lines 50-60).

15. As per claim 17, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 above. In addition, Palaniappan teaches in a computing device, a system comprising:

network access software configured to access a network (Col. 3, lines 52-55; and Fig. 1, item 70);

a cache (Col. 2, lines 5-15; and Fig. 1, item 60);

a cache maintenance mechanism connected to the network access software and configured to maintain information in the cache, the information corresponding to available updates maintained on the network and corresponding to unavailable updates not maintained on the network (Col. 4, lines 10-15, lines 25-30; and Fig. 1, item 70); and

automatic update software connected to access the cache in response to a request for update information on the network (Col. 3, lines 50-60; and Fig. 1, item 70), and to determine from the

information in the cache whether an update is available or not available (Col. 4, lines 10-15, lines 25-30).

16. As per claim 18, Palaniappan teaches the cache maintenance mechanism maintains information in the cache by downloading information into the cache from a network site (Fig 2, item 10, 20).

17. As per claim 19, Palaniappan teaches the request for update information corresponds to a scheduled event (Col. 3, lines 50-60).

18. As per claim 20, Palaniappan teaches the automatic update software locates information about an update to a driver in response to a request for hardware-related updates (inherent in Col. 3, lines 35-40).

19. As per claim 22, Palaniappan teaches the information about the update to the driver comprises an online update and is included in a file in the cache (inherent in Col. 3, lines 35-40).

20. As per claim 23, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 13 above.

21. As per claim 24, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 11 above.

22. As per claim 25, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 14 above.

23. As per claim 26, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 11 above.

24. As per claim 27, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claims 1 and 17 above. In addition, Palaniappan teaches a computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions, comprising:

accessing an online source to obtain information related to available updates and information related to unavailable updates (Fig 2, item 10, 20; Col. 3, lines 52-55, and Col. 4, lines 10-15);

caching the information, the information including information as to the availability and the unavailability of updates (Col. 2, lines 5-15, lines 64-67; Col. 2, lines 10-21; Col. 3, lines 25-35; Col. 4,

Art Unit: 2152

lines 10-15, where the information is the meta-information, and version information dictates the availability and unavailability of the software package);

receiving a request directed to whether a particular update is available for download from the online source (Col. 3, lines 50-60); and

accessing the cache to determine whether the particular update is available for download from the online source (Col. 3, lines 50-60; and Col. 4, lines 10-15).

25. As per claim 28, Palaniappan teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 27 wherein the online source is accessed via an Internet site (Fig 1).

26. As per claim 29, Palaniappan teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 27 wherein the cache indicates that the particular update is available, and further comprising, downloading the update (Col. 4, lines 45-50).

27. As per claim 30, Palaniappan teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 27 wherein the cache indicates that the particular update is available, and further comprising, persisting information corresponding to the update for later download of the update (Col. 3, lines 50-60; Col. 4, lines 50-60).

28. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

29. Claims 5-6, 8-9, 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Palaniappan, as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Yasui et al. (hereinafter Yasui), JP 09-288572.

30. As per claims 5 and 6, Palaniappan teaches invention substantially as rejected in claim 4 above, but does not explicitly teach at least some of the data identifying whether the driver is available for download is maintained in a bitmask.

In a similar system, Yasui teaches the concept of at least some of data identifying whether a driver is available for download is maintained in a bitmask (Yasui, Specification, [0006]-[0008]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention was made to combine the teaching of Palaniappan and Yasui because the teaching of Yasui to allow wherein at least some of the data identifying whether the driver is available for download is maintained in a bitmask would improve the latency and efficiency for Palaniappan's system by using simple algorithm for looking for a bit or flag indication of a newly available update for the system software/hardware.

31. As per claim 8, Palaniappan teaches invention substantially as rejected in claim 4 above, but does not teach a setting of the bit indicates whether a file containing update information can be locally accessed.

In a similar system, Yasui teaches the concept of setting of a bit which indicates whether a file containing update information can be locally accessed (Specification, [0006], [0017]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention was made to combine the teaching of Palaniappan and Yasui because the teaching of Yasui to allow wherein a setting of the bit indicates whether a file containing update information can be locally accessed would improve the latency and efficiency for Palaniappan's system by using simple algorithm for looking for a bit or flag indication of a newly available update for the system software/hardware.

32. As per claim 9, Palaniappan teaches invention substantially as rejected in claim 8 above, including accessing the file, and searching for data therein corresponding to the hardware device (Col. 4, lines 50-60).

However, Palaniappan does not teach the bit setting indicating that the file can be locally accessed.

In a similar system, Yasui teaches the concept of a bit setting indicates that the file can be locally

accessed (Yasui, Specifications [0006]-[0008], [0017]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention was made to combine the teaching of Palaniappan and Yasui because the teaching of Yasui to allow wherein the bit setting indicates that the file can be locally accessed would improve the latency and efficiency for Palaniappan's system by using simple algorithm for looking for a bit or flag indication of a newly available update for the system software/hardware.

33. As per claim 21, Claim 21 is rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 5 above.

34. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Palaniappan - Yasui, in view of Angelo, US 5,944,821.

35. As per claim 7, Palaniappan and Yasui teaches invention substantially as rejected in claim 6 above, but do not explicitly teach the bit is determined by hashing an identifier corresponding to the hardware device.

However, Angelo teaches the concept of a bit determined by hashing an identifier corresponding to the hardware device (Angelo, Col. 4, lines 31-40, lines 63-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention was made to combine the teaching of Palaniappan, Yasui and Angelo because the teaching of Angelo to allow wherein the bit is determined by hashing an identifier corresponding to the hardware device would improve the security Palaniappan and Yasui's system by using encryption algorithm to hide the hardware profiles from potential security threats.

Response to Arguments

36. Applicant's remarks filed 01/18/2006 have been considered but are found not persuasive in view

Art Unit: 2152

of the new grounds of rejection necessitated by Applicant's amendment.

37. In the remarks, Applicant argued in substance Palaniappan does not teach store any information related to the unavailability of updates.

In response to Applicant's remarks, information related to unavailability and availability is the meta-information disclosed in Palaniappan. In one embodiment, the meta information contains version information / release information of the software, after receiving and storing the meta-information, the system compares and determines if an available update is present or not based on the meta-information (Col. 2, lines 10-21; Col. 3, lines 30-35; Col. 4, lines 10-17).

38. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reined of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

39. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following patents and publications are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to "method AND SYSTEM FOR ENABLING OFFLINE DETECTION OF SOFTWARE UPDATES".

- i. US 5881292 Sigal et al.

Art Unit: 2152


- ii. US 6581159 Nevis et al.
- iii. US 6618735 Krishnaswami et al.
- iv. US 6212632 Surine et al.
- v. "Meeting report Cybermedia", Bin Ly, Dec 11, 1997
- vi. "Locate and install software and driver updates. A comparison of Cybermedia's Oil Change and Synmantec's Norton Web Services.", Sandra Underhill, November 30, 1999.
- vii. "Oil Change" Forrest Stroud, June 25, 1998
- viii. US 5442771 Filepp et al.
- ix. US 5896523 Bissett et al.
- x. US 5793970 Fakes et al.
- xi. US 6085333 DeKoning et al.
- xii. US 6125388 Reisman.
- xiii. US 6148349 Chow et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chad Zhong whose telephone number is (571)272-3946. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:15 to 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, JAROENCHONWANIT, BUNJOB can be reached on (571)272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see [http://pair-](http://pair-direct.uspto.gov)

[direct.uspto.gov](http://pair-direct.uspto.gov). Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



BUNJOB JAROENCHONWANIT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Application/Control Number: 09/742,795

Page 11

Art Unit: 2152

CZ

March 16th, 2006